

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
March 3rd, 2004
Aeronautics Commission Room
2700 East Airport Service Drive
Lansing, Michigan

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present

Carmine Palombo, Chairman
Aaron Hopper, Member
Bill McEntee, Member
Jerry Richards, Member
Eric Swanson, Member
Pat Lockwood, Commission Advisor

Thomas Wieczorek, Vice Chairman
John Kolessar, Member
Susan Mortel, Member
Kirk Steudle, Member
Steve Warren, Member

Absent

Richard Deuell, Member

Staff Present

Rick Lilly, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Rob Surber, Center for Geographic Information
Ron Vibbert, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Gil Chesbro, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Brad Winkler, Bureau of Transportation Planning

Call to Order

Chairman Palombo called the meeting to order at 1:10pm.

Approval of the February 4th, 2004 Council Minutes

Chairman Palombo presented the [February 4th, 2004 Council minutes](#) and asked if there were any comments. No comments were made. Vice Chair Wieczorek moved for the approval of the minutes supported by Mr. Richards. The minutes were unanimously approved as submitted.

Correspondence and Announcements

Ms. Lockwood announced that the next meeting of the State Transportation Commission is a joint meeting with the Aeronautics Commission. The individual Commission meetings will commence at 9:00am and the joint meeting will begin at 11:00am on March 25th. The Council will also be making the Data Collection Presentation at this meeting.

During the last Commission meeting, Director Jeff gave a presentation giving the overview of the state budget highlighting the transportation budget and the challenges we face.

Secondly, Ms. Lockwood announced that there were no new appointments on two open seats on the Commission. Until the Commission gets further information from the Governor's Office, the current members will stay on temporarily.

Ms. Lockwood also noted that the City of Rochester will be receiving the new pedestrian crosswalks. These crosswalks are the first of their kind, and are being installed as a pilot project. This will not be funded by M-DOT.

Mr. Lilly announced that the Council's 2004-2005 Budget has been submitted to the Legislature as part of the Department's Budget.

Secondly, Mr. Lilly passed out the draft 2004-2006 work program (no action will be taken today). Mr. Lilly noted that not all items contained in the report at this point have been identified specifically with a work activity, so there is still work to be done. The work program is based upon the Goals and Objectives Statement. Mr. Lilly hopes to have the work program ready for approval during the April meeting.

Monthly Reports

Mr. Lilly announced that the Council received an updated Year-End Expense Report along with the Monthly Report for February. Mr. Lilly noted that the data collection expenses are still under-budget, however, all charges have not yet been recorded. In general, the Council came in under-budget in most categories. Mr. Lilly asked for approval of the Final Year-End Expense Report. Vice Chair Wieczorek moved for the approval, supported by Mr. Hooper. The Year-End Expense Report was unanimously approved.

Committee Reports

Administrative and Education Committee (reported by Mr. Kolessar):

Topic 1: Pilot Project Selection Criteria

The Committee spent time discussing what the criteria should be for evaluating the pilot projects submittals. Submitted proposals should support sub-committee needs and the Council's workplan and goals. The Committee is developing specific criteria to determine whether or not the submittals do in fact support our initiatives. The Committee will be continuing this discussion and will bring results to the Council at a later date.

Topic 2: Draft of the Education and Communication Plan

The draft has been submitted to the sub-committee for evaluation. The Committee will be conducting a review and will return comments to the Council.

Topic 3: Possibility of Attending NHI Course on Transportation Asset Management

The Committee would like to bring the course here for Council members to attend and tweak the course so it applies to the current issues we face.

Recommendations from Commission

Cost: \$200 each

Attendees: Council, Council staff, MML Representative, Moderator of the Asset Management task force from Summit, and CRAM Representative

Cost Not to Exceed: \$5,000.00

Assessment: Scope of course, and delivery of course (quality)

Dates Location: One day session – one location in Lansing (Rick will check availability at Secondary Center)
April 13-15, April 27-28, or May 25-28

Decision: Vice Chair Wieczorek moved for the approval of Thursday, April 15th to be the date of the course and to appropriate up to \$5,000. Mr. McEntee supported that motion. Chairman Palombo asked for discussion. Mr. Steudle asked if the limit to attendees would be 20. Mr. Kolessar replied that yes, we wanted to limit the enrollment for the first time in order to allow time for evaluation. The Council unanimously approved.

Data Management Committee (reported by Mr. McEntee):

Topic 1: Agreement with CGI for Data Storage and Other Related Items

The Data Committee has received first real cost estimate from CGI. The Committee is attempting to develop a procedure to coordinate with MDOT staff and CGI to move forward on payment. Costs include: develop data storage location, security measures and monthly data storage. Actual costs will be reflected in periodic reports from CGI. CGI will submit these reports directly to the Data Committee. Mr. Lilly will annotate these costs in the Quarterly Reports.

Topic 2: Comparison of TAMC PASER Ratings and Sufficiency PASER Ratings

Mr. Chesbro displayed a statewide map displaying the difference between the Sufficiency PASER and Asset Management PASER Ratings. Mr. Chesbro commented that some large differences occurred where projects had taken place, and some issues are in regard to chip seals over asphalt. Mr. Chesbro also provided a table displaying the differences in ratings. The tables showed that 93% of the time the ratings were in general agreement. Mr. Warren asked if the Sufficiency data collection would be collecting PASER data again. Mr. Warren suggested having a procedure in place to collect a small sample to do quality assurance checks. Mr. Warren continued noting that the Sufficiency PASER ratings are only for trunklines. Mr. Chesbro replied that the GIS Team would work on coming up with some procedures to do a sample collection for quality check / control purposes.

Topic 3: Annual Report Data and Outline – Presentation to Commission

Mr. Lilly announced that the presentation of data will be made to the Commission at the end of March. The Annual Report will be ready for review at the April Council meeting.

Strategic Analysis Committee (reported by Mr. Warren):

Topic 1: Goals and Objectives

Topic 2: Selection of a Model (catalog provided by Mr. Lilly)

Topic 3: Multi-Year Work Program

Topic 4: Follow-Up From December Workshop

Mr. Warren briefly discussed the key topics that the Strategic Committee is working on.

Approval of Objectives

Mr. Warren presented the [Goals and Objectives document dated 03/02/2004](#). Mr. Warren stated that the Strategic Analysis Committee recommends that the document be adopted by the Council. Mr. Warren also noted that upon adoption, the Committee will be able to move forward in creating the draft Work Program. Mr. Warren moved for the approval of the Goals and Objectives document. Mr. Kolessar supported that motion. Chairman Palombo asked if there was any discussion. Ms. Mortel asked if the current document included the objectives that the Strategic Committee made during their meeting. Mr. Lilly replied stating that all recommended changes were made. Ms. Mortel noted that the document would form the foundation for the 2004-2006 Work Program Gantt charts. Mr. Lilly agreed, stating that at the next Committee meeting we will be identifying tasks for the Work Program and assigning dates. The Committee will then bring the Work Program to the Council for review and approval. The Goals and Objectives document was unanimously approved.

Approval of Annual Report Outline

NOTE: Mr. Lilly noted that one amendment had been made to the current Annual Report Outline draft. The change occurred in the second part "...condition assessment of federal-aid eligible system..." Mr. Lilly removed the word "condition", because we are not *only* assessing condition.

Mr. Lilly continued stating that the report will contain several basic sections, one to include an introduction. The introduction will briefly discuss why the Council has moved from a needs study to an asset management process. Also, the introduction will focus on pavement condition analysis and PASER general information. Mr. Lilly said the report will contain pictures of distress in relation to condition types. Condition types include: routine maintenance, capital preventative maintenance, and structural improvement. Mr. Lilly also noted that he will stress that PASER is only a surface distress measurement. Next, the Report will include several "system growth" tables and charts that the Data Committee has approved. The Annual Report would then discuss the revenues received by the agencies, and how they are disbursed. The Data Committee decided to remove the expenditure information section because of issues in reporting this data. Mr. Lilly continued to state that the Report will clearly indicate the problems we faced in getting accurate data for investment analysis. Data Collection would be the next topic and will include a breakdown of condition by NFC (National Functional Classification), surface type, and bridges (federal-aid eligible). The Report would also include further statewide and region-wide condition analysis. Examples of a couple agencies data will also be displayed. In particular, the Report will highlight Kent County to show how they have successfully analyzed the data and using the asset management procedure. The last section of the Report will cover what the law requires the Council to report. These items include: what activities the Council did in the previous year, how much money was spent ([Year-End Expense Report](#)), and what the Council anticipates doing in the next year 2004 (Goals and Objectives). The Report will also include an appendix. The appendix will contain photos of the PASER distress types, and a chart from WUPPDR to show how they are displaying the data. Mr. Lilly asked that the Council approve this outline. Mr. Hopper moved for the approval supported by Vice Chair Wieczorek. The outline was unanimously approved.

Data Collection Presentation

Mr. Lilly stated that the Council's [Data Collection Presentation](#) will be given to the State Transportation Commission by Chairman Palombo. The Presentation will cover the following 4 areas: process, cost of project, data results, and where the Council is headed. The Presentation will stress that this is a visual, windshield survey using the PASER principles. The Presentation will also discuss that this is a cooperative effort across the State. Next, the Presentation will report the amount of time it took to collect the data, and the fact that the cost measurements were also significantly lower than what we had estimated. Mr. Kolessar pointed out that the hours reported in the Presentation are crew hours. Mr. Lilly agreed to change the Presentation to include that statement. Mr. Warren also mentioned that the costs may go up. Mr. Warren noted that the Council agreed that we will not be rushing as much this year, and therefore, our cost may go up. Mr. Steudle suggested this being a verbal statement to the Commission. The Presentation will then discuss the data and results and areas where we had issues with the data (overlaps). Ms. Mortel asked if the Presentation could include our quality control checks. Mr. Lilly agreed to add this to the Presentation. Ms. Mortel asked what would be included in the Presentation in regards to our problems in receiving cost data. Mr. Lilly replied stating that we would talk with the Commission about the problems in reporting the expenditure data; however, we are working to fix the problem. Chairman Palombo suggested pulling all of this information out. The Council agreed and suggested including it in the Annual Report. Chairman Palombo asked for any other comments. Ms. Mortel asked that the titles on the charts be more descriptive of the contents. Ms. Mortel also suggested that Mr. Lilly add more "speaker notes" into the Presentation. Chairman Palombo agreed and mentioned that this Presentation could then be used by other council members. Mr. Warren also mentioned that the Presentation may falsely give the idea that data collection is all that the Council does. He suggested having some more information in the overview area, and add speaker notes in regards to this. Mr. Lilly also mentioned that this Presentation would be useful to have at the CRAM meeting prior to the Commission Meeting. Mr. Lilly asked if we would need approval from the Commission before doing so. Mr. Steudle suggested making the Presentation to CRAM without the actual data being presented. The other items of the Presentation are "common-knowledge". Mr. Lilly agreed to send both the revised Presentation and remove the data slides to the speakers of the CRAM meeting. In closing, Chairman Palombo noted that the Council needs to send out comments to the entire Council when they are made in regards to changing / updating draft documents.

Method of Data Collection for 2004:

Mr. Lilly opened this discussion stating that the Data Committee has recommended allowing RoadSoft agencies to continue collecting data with RoadSoft, and the other agencies can use Maptitude. Mr. Steudle noted that the Council has agreed to test different products that are available, and the decision to use both products is a continuation of that effort. Mr. Steudle also commented that given the problems we had with RoadSoft in the large, urban areas, it may be more feasible to use Maptitude. Mr. Vibbert noted that there is a question about who is the "agency". The question is whether or not to allow all 617 agencies to make this choice, or should it be a county-

level decision. Mr. Steudle asked if we could make this a region-wide decision. Mr. Lilly replied stating that no one region is made up of just RoadSoft users. Therefore, making the decision on a county-wide basis would be most feasible. Mr. Warren also suggested that the focus should be on how we will use the data, not so much on how we collect the data. Mr. Warren feels the data collection should be seamless and the implementation into our model should be as well. Mr. Warren continued stating that the Council needs to make the selection of strategic model(s) the Council will support. In doing so, Mr. Warren suggested that the Council could develop a “toolbox” that the agencies can use to select which will work best for their needs. Mr. Warren asked how we should collect the data so that it can be used in any model seamlessly. Mr. Warren stated that he sees the flexibility of the data as being crucial to making the process work. Mr. Vibbert noted that in RoadSoft the data is collected in a proprietary format, the challenge we face is getting the data out. Mr. Swanson also mentioned that regardless of the way the data is collected it needs to come to the Council in a generic format. In other words, Mr. Swanson suggests having a common data format requiring the vendors to work within those parameters. Therefore, the data could be used in various strategic model applications. Mr. Lilly noted that making changes to the current RoadSoft version cannot be made for this year of data collection. The current work program has already been accepted by all parties and we cannot authorize payment for any changes. Mr. Lilly also noted that getting Maptitude data into RoadSoft requires sending the data to Terry McNich to be input into RoadSoft. Mr. Steudle asked if that is cost / time efficient. Mr. Lilly noted he will be meeting with RoadSoft representatives at the CRAM meeting to get more information. The Council will not need to make a decision until after the March 16th Users Group Meeting. The Council can then have further discussion at the April Council meeting. Mr. Chesbro asked that concrete decisions be made. The decisions are as follows:

1. Use RoadSoft and Maptitude for data collection
2. Urban areas should be encouraged to use Maptitude
3. Chairman Palombo suggested that after the RoadSoft Users Group meeting, we develop some more criteria and procedures in terms of the decision of what software should be used
4. Because of the time frame in the release of Framework, data collection will not begin before July
5. Mr. Steudle will address the staffing issue (MDOT region personnel)
6. Mr. Chesbro has approval to start setting up training dates for June

Miscellaneous Comments

Mr. Kolessar asked that Mr. Lilly provide a write-up and description of the April 15th NHI Course on Asset Management. Mr. Lilly agreed to send information out to everyone.

Public Comment

There was no public comment made.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35pm.

Commission Advisor